

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO	. Б	FILING DATE	. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/099,972 03/19/2002		03/19/2002	Shunpei Yamazaki	740756-2457	5505	
31780	7590	07/15/2005		EXAM	INER	
ERIC ROBINSON			•	DEO, DUY V	DEO, DUY VU NGUYEN	
PMB 955 21010 SOUTHBANK ST.		ST.		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
POTOMAC FALLS, VA 20165				1765		
				DATE MAILED: 07/15/200	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Commons	10/099,972	YAMAZAKI ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	DuyVu n. Deo	1765					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with t	he correspondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply of within the statutory minimum of thirty (30 will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS, cause the application to become ABAND	be timely filed) days will be considered timely. from the mailing date of this communication. ONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status		·					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 M	<u>ay 2005</u> .						
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This							
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11	I, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims							
4) Claim(s) <u>7-14,21-29 and 37-47</u> is/are pending i	Claim(s) 7-14,21-29 and 37-47 is/are pending in the application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •						
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine							
	epted or b)□ objected to by t						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	• •					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	**						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	taminer. Note the attached Of	ilice Action of form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 		9(a)-(d) or (f).					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents		ication No					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	rity documents have been red	eived in this National Stage					
application from the International Bureau	u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not rec	eived.					
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		mary (PTO-413)					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	_	ail Date nal Patent Application (PTO-152)					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/11/05</u> .	6) Other:						

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 23, 27, 29, 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (US 6,440,865) and Wolf (Silicon Processing for the VLSI Era)

Lee describes a method for metal etching comprising: forming a Ti layer 34 (claimed 1st conductive), forming a Al alloy layer 38 (claimed 2nd conductive layer) on the Ti layer, forming a TiN layer (claimed third conductive layer) 40 on the Al alloy layer (col. 2, line 45-60); pattering the Ti, Al alloy, and the TiN to form a conductive layer with a taper portion (col. 3, line 1-25). Unlike claimed invention, Lee doesn't describe subjecting the conductive layer with a taper portion to a plasma treatment. However, figures 4 and 5 show that the resist has to be removed in order to form the layer 44 and Wolf shows that the conventional resist stripper includes subjecting the resist, and the conductive layer since it is exposed by the resist layer, to an oxygen plasma (page 518). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skill in the art to remove the resist in light of Wolf's teaching because Wolf further describes a method to remove the resist that is silent in Lee in order to clear the resist for the next step.

Referring to claim 47, since the conductive layers made up of metals and exposed to oxygen plasma during resist stripping, they would be oxidized.

Application/Control Number: 10/099,972

Art Unit: 1765

3. Claims 26, 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee and Wolf as applied to claim 23 above, and further in view of Colgan et al. (US 5,912,506).

Referring to claims 26, 28, Lee doesn't suggest the first conductive layer comprises of W or Mo and the third conductive layer comprises of Ti. Colgan describes different structures that having a first layer of Mo or W, the second layer of Al, and the third layer of Ti (col. 3, line 5-52). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to use other type of materials, depending on the type of device being manufactured, such as one suggested by Colgan in order to form a TFT structure with a reasonable expectation of success.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 7-22, 24, 25, 37-46 remained allowed.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 23, 26-29, 47 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DuyVu n. Deo whose telephone number is 571-272-1462. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:00-2:30 Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nadine Norton can be reached on 571-272-1465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/099,972 Page 4

Art Unit: 1765

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*Primary Examiner Duy-Vu N. Deo

7,/14/05